

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA

Adrian Fulton,)	C/A No. 4:10-1939-RBH-TER
)	
Plaintiff,)	
)	Report and Recommendation
vs.)	
)	
)	
Williamsburg Detention Center,)	
)	
Defendants.)	
_____)	

The Plaintiff, Adrian Fulton (“Plaintiff”), files this case pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983. A detainee at Williamsburg County Detention Center, Plaintiff alleges that the defendants have failed to provide Plaintiff with appropriate medical care. As Plaintiff fails to state a claim for deliberate indifference to a serious medical need, this case should be summarily dismissed.

Pro Se and In Forma Pauperis Review

Under established local procedure in this judicial district, a careful review has been made of the *pro se* complaint pursuant to the procedural provisions of 28 U.S.C. § 1915; 28 U.S.C. § 1915A; and the Prison Litigation Reform Act, Pub. L. No. 104-134, 110 Stat. 1321 (1996). This review has been conducted in light of the following precedents: *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. 25 (1992); *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 324-25 (1989); *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519 (1972); *Nasim v. Warden, Md. House of Corr.*, 64 F.3d 951 (4th Cir. 1995); and *Todd v. Baskerville*, 712 F.2d 70 (4th Cir. 1983).

This complaint has been filed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1915, which permits an indigent litigant to commence an action in federal court without prepaying the administrative costs of proceeding with the lawsuit. To protect against possible abuses of this privilege, the statute allows a district court to dismiss the case upon a finding that the action “fails to state a claim on which

relief may be granted” or is “frivolous or malicious.” 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B)(i), (ii). A finding of frivolity can be made where the complaint “lacks an arguable basis either in law or in fact.” *Denton v. Hernandez*, 504 U.S. at 31. A claim based on a meritless legal theory may be dismissed *sua sponte* under 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B). See *Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319 (1989); *Allison v. Kyle*, 66 F.3d 71 (5th Cir. 1995).

This Court is required to liberally construe *pro se* documents, *Erickson v. Pardus*, 551 U.S. 89 (2007); *Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97 (1976), holding them to a less stringent standard than those drafted by attorneys, *Hughes v. Rowe*, 449 U.S. 9 (1980). Even under this less stringent standard, however, the *pro se* complaint is subject to summary dismissal. The mandated liberal construction afforded to *pro se* pleadings means that if the court can reasonably read the pleadings to state a valid claim on which the plaintiff could prevail, it should do so. However, the requirement of liberal construction does not mean that the court can ignore a clear failure in the pleading to allege facts which set forth a claim currently cognizable in a federal district court. *Weller v. Dep’t of Soc. Servs.*, 901 F.2d 387 (4th Cir. 1990).

Discussion

This complaint is filed pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983, which “is not itself a source of substantive rights,’ but merely provides ‘a method for vindicating federal rights elsewhere conferred.”’ *Albright v. Oliver*, 510 U.S. 266, 271(1994) (quoting *Baker v. McCollan*, 443 U.S. 137, 144 n.3 (1979)). A civil action under § 1983 allows “a party who has been deprived of a federal right under the color of state law to seek relief.” *City of Monterey v. Del Monte Dunes at Monterey, Ltd.*, 526 U.S. 687, 707. To state a claim under § 1983, a plaintiff must allege two essential elements: (1) that a right secured by the Constitution or laws of the United States was violated, and

(2) that the alleged violation was committed by a person acting under the color of state law. *West v. Atkins*, 487 U.S. 42, 48 (1988).

The law is clear that correctional systems are required to provide medical care to inmates, and detention facilities are required to provide medical treatment to detainees. *Helling v. McKinney*, 509 U.S. 25 (1993):

[W]hen the State takes a person into its custody and holds him there against his will, the Constitution imposes upon it a corresponding duty to assume some responsibility for his safety and general well being. . . . The rationale for this principle is simple enough: when the State by the affirmative exercise of its power so restrains an individual's liberty that it renders him unable to care for himself, and at the same time fails to provide for his basic human needs – *e.g.*, food, clothing, shelter, medical care, and reasonable safety – it transgresses the substantive limits on state action set by the Eighth Amendment.

Id. at 32 (quoting *DeShaney v. Winnebago County Dept. of Social Services*, 489 U.S. 189, 199-200 (1989)).

However, with respect to medical care, a prisoner in a § 1983 case "must allege acts or omissions sufficiently harmful to evidence deliberate indifference to serious medical needs." *Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. 97, 106 (1976). The Supreme Court has also stated that not "every claim by a prisoner that he has not received adequate medical treatment states a violation." *Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. at 105. "Although the Constitution does require that prisoners be provided with a certain minimum level of medical treatment, it does not guarantee to a prisoner the treatment of his choice." *Jackson v. Fair*, 846 F.2d 811, 817 (1st Cir. 1988). In addition, while the provision of medical care by prison or jail officials is not discretionary, the type and amount of medical treatment is discretionary. See *Brown v. Thompson*, 868 F. Supp. 326 & n. 2 (S.D.Ga. 1994).

In *Lamb v. Maschner*, 633 F. Supp. 351 (D.Kan. 1986), the district court ruled that the proper inquiry is whether the prison or jail provided any treatment, and that the plaintiff's agreement

or disagreement with the treatment is irrelevant:

Even though plaintiff and defendants have a differing opinion as to the proper treatment to be received by plaintiff, this does not in and of itself state a constitutional violation. *See Smart v. Villar*, 547 F.2d 112 (10th Cir. 1976). Therefore, the key question in this case is whether the defendants have provided plaintiff with some kind of treatment, regardless of whether it is what plaintiff desires.

Lamb v. Maschner, 633 F. Supp. at 353. In the instant complaint, Plaintiff indicates that after he suffered a slip-and-fall on July 7, 2010, he received medical attention for his injuries to his neck and back. Complaint at 3. Though he was seen in a hospital for those injuries, he complains that five days later, on July 12th, he asked for further medical attention and did not receive it for eleven (11) hours. Currently, he complains that he is “still not gettin (sic) the right treatment.” Complaint at 4. As Plaintiff is clearly receiving medical treatment for his injury, he fails to show deliberate indifference on the part of the defendant.

At most, Plaintiff’s claim that the defendants did not provide the preferred care sounds in negligence. However, negligent or incorrect medical treatment is not actionable under § 1983. *Estelle v. Gamble*, 429 U.S. at 106. *See also Daniels v. Williams*, 474 U.S. 327, 328-36 & n.3 (1986); *Davidson v. Cannon*, 474 U.S. 344, 345-48 (1986); *Ruefly v. Landon*, 825 F.2d 792, 793-94 (4th Cir. 1987). Plaintiff does not explicitly state that he is attempting to state a claim for negligence for the initial injury; however, even if so, a slip-and-fall claim would sound in negligence and thus would be no more successful than the medical negligence claim.

The Fourth Circuit has recognized that a delay in medical treatment can state a claim for deliberate indifference. *See Smith v. Smith*, 589 F.3d 736 (4th Cir. 2009)(allegation that treatment was delayed for 17 days due to defendant’s interference states a claim for deliberate indifference). However, the instant complaint alleges a much less serious delay than that in *Smith* (eleven hours

as opposed to seventeen days), and it isn't clear if he is alleging that defendants deliberately disregarded a serious medical need on that date, much less one that had not already been addressed by medical personnel. Therefore, Plaintiff's complaint is subject to summary dismissal for failure to state a claim upon which relief may be granted.

Recommendation

Accordingly, it is recommended that the District Judge dismiss the complaint in the above-captioned case without prejudice and without issuance and service of process. *See United Mine Workers v. Gibbs*, 383 U.S. 715 (1966). *See also Neitzke v. Williams*, 490 U.S. 319, 324-25 (1989); *Haines v. Kerner*, 404 U.S. 519 (1972). **Plaintiff's attention is directed to the important notice on the next page.**

s/Thomas E. Rogers, III

Thomas E. Rogers, III

U.S. Magistrate Judge

September 15, 2010
Florence, SC

Notice of Right to File Objections to Report and Recommendation

The parties are advised that they may file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation with the District Judge. Objections must specifically identify the portions of the Report and Recommendation to which objections are made and the basis for such objections. “[I]n the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note).

Specific written objections must be filed within fourteen (14) days of the date of service of this Report and Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b); *see* Fed. R. Civ. P. 6(a), (d). Filing by mail pursuant to Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 5 may be accomplished by mailing objections to:

Larry W. Propes, Clerk
United States District Court
Post Office Box 2317
Florence, South Carolina 29503

Failure to timely file specific written objections to this Report and Recommendation will result in waiver of the right to appeal from a judgment of the District Court based upon such Recommendation. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140 (1985); *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841 (4th Cir. 1985); *United States v. Schronce*, 727 F.2d 91 (4th Cir. 1984).